

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer, and amended claims 1, 2, 12, and 13. Claims 1, 2, 5-13, and 16-19 are pending. Claims 5-11 and 16-19 are withdrawn.

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,257,486 ("*Teicher*"), and rejected claims 2, 4, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Teicher* and U.S. Patent No. 6,170,060 ("*Mott*").

CLAIMS 1 AND 12

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on *Teicher*.

In order to properly anticipate a claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of the claim at issue must be found, either expressly or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim[s]." See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th Ed. May 2004). And, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *Id.*

In the present case, *Teicher* fails to teach or suggest a connection control method comprising "a switch configured to switch between a first state and a second state; an inhibition unit configured to inhibit the authentication of the first device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the first state, while permitting an authentication of a second device by a link key, the second device having been

connected to the access point before; and a permission unit configured to permit the authentication of the first device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the second state," as recited in claim 1.

Teicher merely discloses a smart card read for secure entry of a secret personal identification number (PIN). *Teicher*, Abstract. A user directly enters the PIN into the smart card when the card is presented to a smart card reader. *Id.* Because the user directly enters the PIN into the smart card, the PIN is authenticated by the smart card itself and is not propagated outside the smart card. *Id.* Hence, the PIN can not be stolen through the use of a compromised smart card reader. *Id.*

Fig. 11 of *Teicher* discloses that an authentication module 1105 is normally in a disabled state, whereby any attempt by a user to perform an authentication is rejected. *Id.*, col. 14, lines 47-49. However, when the user presents the smart card to the reader, authentication module 1105 is enabled. *Id.*, col. 14, lines 49-53. So long as the smart card remains presented to the reader, authentication module 1105 will be able to perform an authentication. *Id.*, col. 14, lines 53-55. This is not the same as and does not suggest "a switch configured to switch between a first state and a second state; an inhibition unit configured to inhibit the authentication of the first device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the first state, while permitting an authentication of a second device by a link key, the second device having been connected to the access point before; and a permission unit configured to permit the authentication of the first device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the second state," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, because *Teicher* fails to teach each and every element recited in claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on *Teicher* should be withdrawn. Further, although claim 12 contains different limitations and has a different scope from claim 1, the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on *Teicher* should be withdrawn for reasons similar to the ones discussed above for claim 1.

CLAIMS 2 AND 13

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Teicher* and *Mott*.

Claims 2 and 13 depend upon claims 1 and 12, and therefore, include all limitations recited in claims 1 and 12, respectively. As discussed above, *Teicher* fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1 and 12. *Mott* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Teicher*.

Mott merely discloses a method of targeting a digital information playback device. *Mott*, Abstract. A device ID or a group ID is embedded in the playback device and a digital information file. *Id.* Upon receiving a digital information file, the device ID or group ID of the playback device is compared with the device ID or group ID contained in the digital information file. *Id.* This is not the same as and does not suggest “a switch configured to switch between a first state and a second state; an inhibition unit configured to inhibit the authentication of the first device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the first state, while permitting an authentication of a second device by a link key, the second device having been connected to the access point before; and a permission unit configured to permit the authentication of the first

device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the second state," as recited in claim 1. Neither is it the same as nor does it suggest "permitting the authentication of the first device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the second state; and inhibiting the authentication of the first device by the specific identification code when the switch is set in the first state, while permitting an authentication of a second device by a link key, the second device having been connected to the access point before," as recited in claim 12.

Accordingly, because *Teicher* and *Mott*, separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1 and 12, the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Teicher* and *Mott* should be withdrawn at least by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1 and 12, in addition to the patentable subject matter respectively recited in therein.

CLAIMS 3, 4, 14, AND 15

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 3, 4, 14, and 15. However, in order to advance the prosecution of this case, Applicant has canceled claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter contained in claims 3, 4, 14, and 15 at a later time in the present application or another application (e.g., a continuation application).

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 5, 2005

By: 
Kenie Ho
Reg. No. 51,808